

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 14, 2005. Claims 1 to 23 are in the application, of which claims 1, 9, 10, 17, 19 and 20 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Page 2 of the Office Action included a request for Applicants to "provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where the best support is found", with a reference being made to 35 U.S.C. § 132. However, since no objection was entered under § 132, Applicants are unsure of the nature of this request, and are uncertain as to what is being requested of them. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Formal objections were lodged against claims 1 to 23, and it was specifically requested to use the definite article "the" when referring to the user. Applicants have considered the request, but believe that a change is not needed. Specifically, the indefinite article "a" is being maintained, since the article refers to the user's selection, and not to the user, such that each selection would not necessarily have antecedence if the definite article were used instead. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 9 to 12 and 15 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,123 (Cazemier), and claims 4 to 8, 13 and 14 were rejected under § 103(a) over (Cazemier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,941 (Rowe). The rejections are respectfully traversed. Specifically, it is Applicants' understanding that Cazemier does not append meta data to managed data such that the meta data can be used for a data search of the managed data, but rather merely uses meta data in connection with

the search itself. In this regard, it is felt that the word “meta data” has caused undue emphasis on the same word “meta data” used by Cazemier but for entirely different purposes; accordingly, this amendment changes “meta data” to “keyword”. The basis for Applicants’ traversal is explained in more detail below.

The invention concerns managed data for which it is desired to facilitate a data search thereof, and more particularly concerns appending a keyword for the data search. It is a user that selects the specific keyword that is appended. To ease the burden on the user, a group of candidate keywords is displayed, each group being prepared in advance in correspondence to a type of content of the managed data. The display is changed in response to a change in the selected type of content. A user selects a keyword from the displayed group of candidate keywords, and the selected keyword and the data are stored in association with each other.

Because the keyword is stored in association with the data, the invention achieves its intended effect of facilitating a data search of the managed data, which can be searched based on the appended keyword.

In contrast, while it is true that Cazemier pertains to searching of a database, Cazemier uses its meta data as a query, and does not append its meta data to the data actually stored in the database. Referring specifically to lines 3 to 6 at Cazemier’s column 7, which was cited in the Office Action, a user interface 25 is described which allows a user to maintain the meta data. However, it is Applicants’ understanding that the meta data is not appended to data in the database, but rather is used as a query on the database as mentioned above.

If is therefore respectfully submitted that Cazemier differs fundamentally from the invention herein, such that the rejection under § 102 and § 103 cannot be sustained.

It is believed that the foregoing demonstrates the patentable nature of the subject matter herein. It is also the undersigned's intention to conduct an interview with the Examiner, so that the differences between the invention and the cited art can be explained in greater detail. Accordingly, if the Examiner should reach this case for action before such an interview has been conducted, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California, office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 97585v1